



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## REPORTS.

BEITRÄGE ZUR ASSYRIOLOGIE UND VERGLEICHENDEN SPRACHWISSENSCHAFTEN, herausgegeben von FRIEDRICH DELITZSCH und PAUL HAUPT. I. Band, I. Heft (pp. 1-368), Leipzig (Hinrichs), 1889; II. Heft (pp. 369-636), Leipzig, 1890. II. Band, I. Heft (pp. 1-273), Leipzig, 1891; II. Heft (pp. 274-556), Leipzig, 1892.

Reviews of the first three parts, either singly or together, may be found in the following periodicals: Deutsche Literaturzeitung, 1891, col. 1450, P. Jensen; Hebraica, VI 65, R. Harper; Presb. and Reformed Review, 1890, April, pp. 349 ff., Davis; Revue Critique, 1890 (XXV, p. 481), J. Halevy, and 1892 (pp. 4 ff.), A. Loisy; Ztschr. der deutschen Morgenl. Gesell. XLVI 566, F. Hommel.

The Beiträge zur Assyriologie, of which the last number of the second volume has recently appeared, cannot properly be called a periodical. It was the intention of the editors to issue this journal only at irregular intervals, the publication of the first part of the first volume in the autumn of 1889 having been really an experiment, upon the success of which would depend the continuance of the magazine. The fine array, however, of highly useful articles presented in this number ensured the further success of the undertaking, and the editors have been able thus far to issue a part of the journal every autumn. The Beiträge cannot be said to invade the province of any other magazine devoted to *Orientalia*. The Zeitschrift für Assyriologie, for example, whose domain the new journal approaches nearest, prints much shorter articles and presents, in some respects, quite a different class of matter, besides being, as its name denotes, a regular periodical.

In the first volume of the Beiträge, one of the most important of the articles devoted to the publication and treatment of Assyro-Babylonian texts is that of Friedrich Delitzsch on the Babylonian-Assyrian letter literature (vol. I, pp. 185-248, 613-31; concluded, II 19-62—altogether 127 pages). While most of the texts discussed here are published by S. A. Smith in his Keilinschriften Asurbanipals, vol. II (Leipzig, 1887), and also in the Proceedings of the Society for Biblical Archaeology, vols. IX and X, 1887, 1888, there can be no doubt that Delitzsch's thorough and scholarly treatment of the subject must be the basis for all future investigations in this branch of Assyriology. The stem *takû*, mentioned (p. 198) as a synonym of נָשָׂא 'to lift up,' in connection with the reading *u-tak-ku-ka-ni* of K. 512, rev. 15, is very probably the same as we find in *tukku* 'shield,' which in this case would be an intensive formation. *Takû* may be a secondary stem formed with *t* from an original *\*wky*. Similar formations in Assyrian are *takûlu* 'trust,' from וָכַל 'be strong,' and *tabûlu* 'take away,' from וָבַל 'bring.' On p. 616 Delitzsch has established the meaning of the stem *karûru*, which he shows conclusively must signify 'to pull down'; for example, the foundation of a house. *Karûru* must be the same stem which we

find in the Mishn. כָּרַי and Talm. כְּרִיא, meaning a 'heap,' i. e. something pulled down, drawn together. The original force of כָּרַר may have been 'to turn, turn over.' The stem occurs in Hebrew only in the Pilpel, meaning 'to dance'; cf. 2 Sam. vi. 14, 16.

The next articles dealing with texts which should be mentioned are those by Prof. Haupt, who has contributed about half of the first Heft of the Beiträge. His edition of the 12th tablet of the Nimrod Epic, with nine plates and text-critical remarks (I, pp. 48-79), and his collation of the entire Izdubar legend (I, pp. 94-152), must be regarded as a standard work on the Epic.

The treatise of Dr. Rudolf Zehnpfund on Babylonische Weberrechnungen (I, pp. 492-536, with corrections, pp. 632-36) is a valuable contribution to the literature bearing on the so-called contract tablets. Zehnpfund has chosen thirty-four tablets, chiefly lists of woven materials, which he has thoroughly examined, both grammatically and philologically. Twenty-two others he has discussed more briefly toward the close of his article. The author's treatment of *kudinnu* (p. 505, note 3) is also worthy of notice. Of the three distinctions in derivation made by him, viz. *quṣinnu* 'small' (קֻטִּין), *kudinnu* 'mancipatus,' and *kudunnu* 'mule' (Targ. כִּדְנָא, כִּדְנָא, כִּדְנָא), I would only call attention to the possibility of reading the first not *quṣinnu*, but *tardinnu*, *tardēnu*. It may be regarded as a derivative from the stem *radû* 'to copulate,' with much the same meaning as *radû*, *ridû* 'child, young,' hence 'small.' (See II R. 30, n. 3, 30, 31.) Lehmann's idea that this word applied to a brother, *axu kudinnu* (*kardinnu*), may denote the son of a concubine, or of a wife of unequal rank, and may sometimes be *terminus technicus* for *illegitimate*, is objected to by Bruno Meissner in his new work on Altbabylonisches Privatrecht (p. 152, n. 1). Meissner holds that the word is synonymous with *qixru* 'young,' and reads it *quṣinnu*, from a stem קֻטֵּן, bearing the same relation to Hebrew קָטַן as does קָטַן to the Arabic *qatala*.

Of the eight grammatical articles in the first volume of the Beiträge, Prof. Haupt has contributed four, the most important being those on Assyrian noun-formations, viz. 'Das Nominalpräfix *na* im Assyrischen' (pp. 1-20) and 'Zur Assyrischen Nominallehre' (pp. 158-84). Dr. Haupt accepts the law stated by Barth, Z. A., April, 1887, that the origin of the prefix *n* was due to a dissimilation of an original *m*, influenced by a labial in the stem, but differs from him in many particulars. Haupt has treated the subject exhaustively in both of his articles, and presents a wealth of valuable material in the notes. A list of forms with prefixed *m* and *n* (p. 171) will be found highly useful to the student of Assyrian phonetics.

Martin Jäger, in his article on the Semivowel *ṣ* in Assyrian (I, pp. 443-91), by a comparative treatment of parallel cases in the cognate languages, arrives at the conclusion that the combinations *ia*, *aa*, *ea*, *ua* are found, with few exceptions, only in formations where an original *ṣ* is present. His views, although well set forth, will not be convincing to all.

It is hardly necessary to derive the form *ittašib*, with Jäger (Das babylonische Hauchlautzeichen, p. 591, note), from an original *ituṣšib* with prefixed *t*. *Ittašib*, *ittabil*, etc., can easily be explained as *Ifteal* formations, after the analogy of verbs *Pe Nun*.

Richard Kraetzschmar's two articles on the relative pronoun and relative sentence in Assyrian (I, pp. 379-492), and on the preposition *ša* (I, pp. 583-88), present the results of a careful study of the use of *ša* in the available Assyro-Babylonian literature. Students of this subject should also read Kraetzschmar's short article, The Origin of the Notae Relationis (Hebraica, VI, 1889-90, 296-302).

George Steindorff's interesting discussion of the reproduction of Egyptian proper names in the Cuneiform inscriptions is important for the study of Assyrian phonetics (I, pp. 330-61 and 593-612). His treatment of the proper name *Sib'-e* (pp. 339-42) deserves attention. That this is the correct reading of the name, and not *Shab'i* (Schrader, K. A. T.<sup>2</sup> 269 and 587), is shown by Delitzsch, Paradies, p. 308. Steindorff discusses chiefly whether it is historically possible to identify *Sib'-e* with the Egyptian king *Sabako*, Σαβακών, and rightly concludes, with Winckler, from the insurmountable chronological and philological difficulties, that there can be no connection between the two persons. It is now recognized that *Sib'e* (Biblical, *Seve*) was only an Egyptian *tartān*, or general, or at most a petty prince. (See Delitzsch in Mürdter's Geschichte Babyloniens und Assyriens, 1891, p. 185.)

The Beiträge has taken a departure highly useful to the study of Oriental philology from an historical point of view, by publishing such articles as those of Flemming on the literary relics of G. F. Grotefend (I, pp. 80-93), on the life and work of Job Ludolf, the founder of Ethiopic philology (I, pp. 537-82, concluded II, pp. 63-110), and, in the first Heft of the second volume, on the services rendered to Assyriology by Sir Henry Rawlinson (II, pp. 1-18).

The articles in the first volume which are not of an especially Assyriological character are Nestle's brief treatise on Verbs Medial *š* in Syriac (I, pp. 153-57) and the excellent work of Franz Pretorius on Ethiopic Grammar and Etymology (I, pp. 21-47 and 369-78). In the latter I will only call attention to the author's opinion (p. 34) that the common Ethiopic auxiliary verb *hallawa* is cognate with the Arabic *halkala* 'wait, delay.' He adds to Lagarde's two primitive roots *להל*, the first meaning 'illuminate' and the second 'cry out,' a third *להל*, which must mean 'to wait, remain.' This latter primitive root is probably the same which appears in the stem *להל* 'to dwell,' from which comes the Hebrew derivative *לָחַל* 'tent,' the familiar Assyrian *ālu* (*ahalu*) 'city,' and the rarer fem. formation *āltu* 'family,' for which latter see Jäger, Beitr. II, p. 303. Instances of trilateral stems primæ *š*, probably formed from an original biliteral root, are f. ex. Heb. *שָׁחַח* 'one': Aram. *חַח*, Heb. *אִישׁ* 'be weak,' *נִשְׁשׁ* 'tremble, delay,' *נִשְׂחַח* 'lead astray': Talm. *אִשְׁר* and *יִשְׂר* 'pour out,' etc.

In the first Heft of the second volume of the Beiträge, C. W. Belser's interesting study of three Babylonian *Kudurru* or border-stone records (II, pp. 111-203) should be read in connection with Delitzsch's translation of the Merodach-Baladan stone (II, pp. 258-73). Dr. Belser has, unfortunately, not described any of the inscriptions which he translates, contenting himself with merely referring the reader to Pinches' Guide to the Nimroud Central Saloon (pp. 40-60).

Dr. O. E. Hagen's article on the Cyrus texts (II, pp. 205-48), with *Nachträge* by Friedrich Delitzsch (pp. 248-57), is the best treatment of these inscriptions ever published. The transliteration is based on a new collation of both the Cyrus Cylinder and the Annals of Nabonidus, and the translation throws light, in more than one passage, on the history of the fall of Babylon. Although Hagen has expressly stated that his interest in the documents is more that of an historian than of a philologist, his commentary will materially aid the grammatical and textual study of these inscriptions. The purely historical commentary he has reserved for an independent work on the ancient history of Western Irân. It would not have been out of place, however, had he mentioned some of the former translations of the Cyrus documents, instead of keeping the discussion of them for his later work.

A list of the chief translations and paraphrases of the Cyrus Cylinder and Nabonidus Annals will be found in the Appendix to my Dissertation on Mene Mene Tekel Upharsin.

Hagen's brief statement of the probable condition of affairs at the time of the fall of Babylon is excellent. He points out that the priests of Marduk in Babylon, had it been possible, would have dethroned Nabonidus and placed another native in power. They were compelled, however, by circumstances to hand over the empire to the alien Cyrus, who, by his rapid and victorious approach, had become master of the situation. Hagen very properly distinguishes between the artificial feeling of the Babylonians toward Cyrus, manifested in the Cylinder, and the joyous hope of the captive Jews in their deliverer. The supposition of a new value *zuz* for the character *be* (*bat, til, siz*), in the word *šū-zuz(?) - su-un* 'taken away' (?), in Cyl. 25, seems somewhat forced. The common reading *šubatsun* may be retained and the passage translated as follows: "the yoke which suited them not, their habitation, their disorder (or, with Hagen, their sighing), I quieted," i. e. "I subdued the tyrannical yoke, made peaceful their dwellings once more, and righted their disordered affairs." The passage V. R. 50, 51/52, cited in support of the meaning 'take away' for *našāzu*, is probably to be translated "one the hair of whose body the evil *Rābiqū* has caused to stand up" (*ušzizu*, i. e. 'in fear,' and not 'take away'). The reading of the Annals III 23, *u(?)mār šarri ušma-at* 'and the son of the king he killed,' if correct, establishes definitely the time of the death of Belshazzar, the eldest son of Nabonidus. We may suppose that this prince, while making a last despairing effort against the Persian aggression, was slain by Gobryas' forces shortly after the capture of Nabonidus and the final surrender of Babylon.

Delitzsch, in his additions to Hagen's work, points out a number of easily avoidable errors in the inexact translation of these texts by Eb. Schrader (K. B. III 2, pp. 120-37).

The last part of the *Beiträge* (Bd. II, Heft 2) is quite as interesting as its predecessors.

Edward J. Harper's article on Babylonian legends contains matter highly useful, both from a philological and comparative mythological point of view. The author gives copies of original texts, with ten photographs of tablets and a transliteration, translation, commentary, and discussion of the four legends of Etana, Zu, Adapa and Dibbara (II, pp. 390-521). Harper had already

published a preliminary study of the Etana and Adapa legends in the Academy, Jan. 17 and May 30, 1891.

By far the most attractive legend of the Etana series is the description of the hero's attempt to reach heaven by means of his friend the eagle. Curiously enough, Etana is not represented as riding on the eagle's back during the flight, but as clinging to the bird's breast. The end of the journey is never reached, for, when, after leaving the abode of Anu Bel and Ea, Etana sees the sea like a tiny drop of water beneath him, he orders the eagle to turn back. The bird's strength, however, is exhausted, and, his wings failing him, the bold pair are dashed to earth.

The similes in this account regarding the appearance of the receding earth and sea are very striking.

The tale of Adapa, son of Ea, god of the deep, relates how the young deity broke the wings of the South Wind which had disturbed him in his fishing. The wrathful summons to the youth to appear before Anu and answer for his crime, and the politic advice of Ea to his son, by means of which the anger of Anu was appeased, are the chief features of the story.

This tablet, Dr. Harper informs us, does not belong, like most of the other legends, to the library of Ašurbanipal (669-625 B. C.), but forms part of the El Amarna collection, so that its date would probably be about nine hundred years before Ašurbanipal.

The occurrence in the Etana legend of the plural of *iççáru* 'bird,' *iççáráti*, is a valuable addition to Assyrian forms (p. 400). *Iççáru* must now be added to the list of nouns with masc. sing. ending and fem. pl. formation; cf. *xarránu*, *tuddu*, *náru*, etc.

Harper considers *naglabu* a sort of *patru* 'or dagger' (p. 435). The actual meaning, however, of the stem *gullubu* is not clear. That it does not mean 'shear,' as some have thought, seems evident. Haupt in Beitr. I, p. 15, translated it by 'castrate,' and accordingly explained *naglabu* as an instrument for castration (I, p. 8). Meissner (Altbab. Privatrecht, p. 152) believes that *gullubu* means 'make a mark' and is applicable to the marking of slaves or adopted children. Following this idea, *naglabu* would be an instrument used for this purpose. The idea of 'cutting' seems to underlie the stem *gullubu*, but it is probable, in spite of the comparison in II R. 24, n. 2, 60 d, that *naglabu* was not absolutely synonymous with the general term *patru*. This is indicated, too, by the usage in Harper's passage, where the *nāš patri* are mentioned with *nāš naglabi*.

Dr. Martin Jäger again appears as a contributor, presenting a very welcome study of eighteen proverbs in Sumerian and Assyrian, the text of which is published II R. 16 (Beiträge, II, pp. 274-305). Jäger assigns this copy to the Sargonide period, and classes the contents among the grammatical texts which were prepared by Babylonians for the purpose of learning Sumerian. These sentences are, of course, valuable because of the light which they throw on Babylonian thought, but, as Jäger points out, they possess an especial interest in showing us a sort of proverbial poetry hitherto unknown in Babylonian.

Assyriologists will await with interest Jäger's promised work on the Sumerian-Akkadian question, as his position in this matter is not very clear. He claims to agree in the main with Halevy, believing that almost all the formative

elements of Sumerian show a Semitic origin, but at the same time retains the expression 'Akkadian and Sumerian language.' This apparent inconsistency he promises to explain in his new work.

The following points in Jäger's article are important: the definite establishment of *mī* or *mē* as interr. pron. 'who' (p. 277) and the comparison of the Assyrian *mannu inamdin*, literally 'who will give?' viz. 'O that!' and the Hebrew מִי יִתֵּן (p. 279).

In the extremely difficult proverbial poem (translated No. 3, p. 280) Jäger has found an ingenious solution for the last few lines, by his change of *-ma* (in l. 70) to the negative particle *ul* before *innaši ressu*. He translates: 'lifts not again his head.' It would have been possible, however, retaining *-ma* in accordance with a suggestion of Prof. Haupt, to translate *innaši ressu* 'his poverty increased,' explaining *ressu* 'his poverty' as a cognate of Hebrew רָעַשׁ 'poor.'

Jäger's derivation of *bubātu* 'hunger, food,' from the stem בָּעָה, instead of, with Haupt (Beiträge, I 18), from בָּהוּ, deserves attention (p. 288). An excellent point is the distinction (p. 293) between *šattu* 'year' and *šattu* 'hour.'

It may be mentioned in connection with Jäger's discussion of the *Umlaut* of *a* to *i* under the influence of preceding *u* (p. 295) in forms like *ziqqurit* for *ziqqurat*, that this change was probably due to the pronunciation of the *u* as *ü*, which tended to produce *Umlaut* in a neighboring vowel.

The derivation of *manda* from *ma'du* 'numerous' (p. 300, note) was already mentioned by Hagen (Beiträge, II 231). The translation of *Ummân-manda* by 'great horde' seems undoubtedly the best.

With the exception of J. A. Knudtzon's brief remarks on the text of Layard, 17, 18 (pp. 306-11), and Prof. W. Muss-Arnolt's sketch and bibliography of Jules Oppert (pp. 522-56), the other articles of this number are of a general Semitic character.

The work of Fritz Hommel (II, pp. 342-58) on the relationship of Old Egyptian with Semitic is full of interest, and his comparison of the various grammatical forms of Egyptian seems to show clearly the close connection of that language with the Semitic branch. A somewhat fuller article by Adolf Erman on the same subject, embodying both grammatical and lexicographical comparisons between Egyptian and Semitic, has since appeared (ZDMG 46, 93-129). It seems evident, for example, that the Egyptian perfect tense explained by Hommel (p. 343) contains the same conjugational forms as those in Semitic. The imperfect, also, with the prefix *i* seems to be represented, and, what is still more striking, forms are found with prefixed *i* and pronominal suffixes; thus, Egypt. *i-xx-i* would be equivalent to a Semitic form like *ia-kabula-ta* (p. 346). This appears to indicate that the Sem. *ia* is really not a pronominal element of the 3d sing., but simply a sign of the imperf., which was originally inflected like the perfect with suffixes. The resemblance between Egypt. and Sem. in the pronouns and possessive suffixes is equally noticeable, and it is interesting to observe that Assyro-Babylonian is the Semitic dialect nearest akin to the Egyptian. Hommel offers, in explanation of this fact, two possible hypotheses. Either Bab. and Egypt. form together a distinct Semitic branch, a daughter of the common primitive language, or Egypt. was

originally a dialect of the old North-Bab. Semitic, and a sister of the later Assyro-Babylonian. If either of these ideas be followed, the theory must be abandoned that Egypt. belongs to a 'Hamitic' branch distinct from but closely allied to Semitic.

This brings us to the discussion of the so-called Hamitic languages of East Africa by F. Pretorius (II 312-41). His opinion regarding the original relationship of Semitic and Hamitic is directly opposed to that of Hommel. According to the latter the Berber idioms of Africa are mixed languages with a basis of Egyptian grammar, while the so-called Ethiopic group (including Bedscha) consists of languages which contain an Elamitic substratum with Semitic grammar and an African vocabulary (II, p. 354, n. 3). The original Semitic character of this latter group, however, which is credited by scholars with six languages, cannot, according to Pretorius, be proved. He is only prepared to admit the possibility that, from the very earliest times, even two thousand years before the immigration of the Semitic Ethiopians, a strong Semitic influence may have been brought to bear on the East African dialects, and it is extremely interesting to note, in connection with this, that these traces of Semitic influence are not exclusively of an Ethiopic character, but present some common Semitic peculiarities (p. 321).

Pretorius believes, on the other hand, that the Ethiopic-Semitic languages were very strongly influenced, in their turn, both in grammar and lexicon, by the native dialects.

The matter seems as yet to be open to discussion, for, as the author points out, scholars are not at present in a position even to compare the linguistic material. The treatise promised by Dr. Hommel on this subject (l. c., p. 355) will therefore certainly be of general philological interest.

The first part of Pretorius' article is devoted to a bibliographical statement of the work already done in this field since 1840. The last sections (pp. 320-41) he has reserved for the philological treatment of the group, comparing the various dialects with the Ethiopic and with each other.

The last article to be mentioned is that of F. Philippi on Semitic verbal and nominal formation (II, pp. 359-89), which is really an answer to Barth's defence of his own work on the same subject against Philippi's earlier criticism. The author is quite right in objecting in many points to Barth's method, and especially to his disregard of the force of analogy in Semitic.

It may certainly be said that the *Beiträge zur Assyriologie* embodies most complete grammatical, text-critical and comparative philological material in the special field of Assyro-Babylonian, and is also a valuable aid to all branches of Semitic learning. The journal has now become a necessity to the ever-growing science of Assyriology, and it is to be hoped will appear with the same regularity in the future as has been the case since its establishment.

UNIVERSITY OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK.

J. DYNELEY PRINCE.

---



ENGLISCHE STUDIEN. Herausgegeben von Dr. EUGEN KÖLBING, Heilbronn.  
XVI Band, 1892.

I.—W. Wetz, *The Inner Relations between Shakespeare's Macbeth and his Dramas of Royalty*. This is a comparison of *Macbeth* with *Richard III*, *Henry IV*, and *King John*, with reference to the retribution which overtakes the usurper. Shakespeare is a 'preacher of repentance,' to use an expression of Goethe's. His method is that outlined by Goethe in many places, as, for example, in *Dichtung und Wahrheit*, Bk. 13: "The true representation has no didactic aim. It neither approves nor censures, but, through unfolding the sentiments and actions in their true sequence, illuminates and instructs them." In these tragedies of usurpation, whatever differences there may be in the elaboration of the problem, it is at bottom the same, and Shakespeare's conception and treatment of it is essentially uniform. The retribution consists partly in the growing strength of the antagonisms aroused, and partly in the growing terrors of the guilty conscience; in other words, is partly external and partly internal. On the one hand, fear and suspicion dog the footsteps of the usurper, and both tend to make him cruel and unjust. By his cruelty and injustice his subjects feel themselves absolved from their loyalty, and by the example of his successful rebellion they are encouraged to rebel in their turn. Hence civil discord while the tyrant rules, and instant adhesion to the avenging rival. On the other hand, conscience begins to trouble the usurper from the moment of the commission of his crime, and his torment constantly increases until the loss of his crown, and even of his life, becomes a welcome relief from anguish. Every step of both processes is illustrated in the tragedy of *Macbeth*. In *Richard III* the historic downfall is as complete, while the pangs of conscience are not so fully depicted; but neither in this nor in *King John* and *Henry IV* are the latter absent, though the manner in which they disclose themselves differs with the play. It appears from *As You Like It* that Shakespeare's thoughts were much occupied with usurpation and its consequences, since even in this, one of the lightest and airiest of his comedies, it occupies the background. Accordingly we find that he modifies the chronicle histories that he adapts in order to isolate this problem and treat it in its broad, typical features. So far as he has done this his plays become true dramas, instead of remaining mere spectacular or epic presentations of traditional English history. Shakespeare has but one epic hero, ever confident and joyful whatever may oppose, and that is *Henry V*; if it is the characteristic of the tragic hero to suffer, then those who have been mentioned answer in so far to the definition. Finally, the epic deals with outward events, the drama with psychology; and here again we have a criterion to apply in the case of Shakespeare's adaptations from the chronicle histories.

R. Ackermann, *Studies in Shelley's Prometheus Unbound*. The German commentator on *Alastor*, *Epipsychidion*, *Adonais* and *Hellas* (see *Engl. Stud.* 16. 413) here considers the relation of Shelley's drama to its Aeschylean prototype, and traces some of his more striking expressions to their sources. Thus Shelley's 'Gorgon, Chimaera' (1. 346) goes back to Milton, and his 'cave' and 'cavern' (3. 3) possibly to the nuptial bower of Eve in *Paradise Lost*, though perhaps they are rather the renderings of Shelley's own impres-

sions of the Baths of Caracalla. Hesiod furnished him with some of his elemental conceptions and with the name of Ione (Theog. 255), and Herodotus with Asia as the wife of Prometheus, though she already occurs in Hesiod as the daughter of Oceanus and Thetis. Demogorgon, a word which Littré in his dictionary supposes to be original with Shelley, goes back to Paradise Lost (2. 964), to the Fairy Queen (1. 5. 22), to Marlowe's Faust, Greene's Friar Bacon and History of Orlando Furioso, to Leo Hebraeus, the Italian Neoplatonist (1502), to Boccaccio's *Genealogia Deorum*, and eventually to the scholiasts on Lucan's *Pharsalia* (6. 497 and 744). It is to be regretted that Miss Vida D. Scudder did not utilize this article in her suggestive and, in the main, commendable edition of the *Prometheus Unbound*.

W. Sattler, *Zur Englischen Grammatik*, VII.

A. Würzner, A Decree of the Austrian Ministry of Education concerning Written Exercises in Modern Languages in the Scientific Schools (*Realschulen*).

The Book Notices include a review of Hessels' Eighth-Century Latin-Anglo-Saxon Glossary, one of Müllenhoff's *Beowulf*, of Anne L. Leonhard's Two Middle English Stories from Hell, and of Flügel's and Muret's English-German Dictionaries, besides a number of other works of minor importance. The review of Müllenhoff is by Sarrazin, and emphasizes his theory of the Scandinavian origin of the whole *Beowulf* legend, of the derivation of *Béowu*, *Béowu-* from the ON. *Bǫðvarr* = \**Baðu-(h)arir*, and of the period of the appropriation by the English of the Northern story as between 700 and 800 A. D. His illustrations of the similarity between Old Norse and Old English poetry in respect to style, vocabulary, and phraseology are deserving of attention.

The department of Miscellanea is more interesting than usual. F. Lauchert has a long article on the English Hymns to the Virgin in the Thirteenth Century, from which much can be learned. F. Jentsch considers the Sources of the Middle English Romance, Richard Cœur de Lion. There follow a number of smaller papers, and finally an obituary notice of Alexander J. Ellis, the English phonetist. In the latter is contained part of an autobiographical sketch, from which I quote two or three passages illustrative of Ellis's views concerning the educational process to which he was subjected: "From my eighth to my twelfth year I attended a large classical private school. My time was mainly devoted to Latin; there was little Greek and still less English. . . . The next three years and a half of my life were spent at Shrewsbury School. . . . Here again were Latin and Greek, with a weeny bit of English in shape of themes during half a year. . . . I passed on to Eton for three years longer, under Dr. Keate, a mere classicist. Here Latin and Greek alone formed the course. I had some difficulty in being allowed to take lessons in mathematics from a Cambridge man in overtime. They have changed this now, and admit mathematics into the curriculum, I believe. French, Italian and German were 'extras,' not much cultivated. . . . I was now half a year with a private tutor, and resumed English themes, but gave almost my whole time to Latin and Greek, with a flavor of mathematics. Cambridge now loomed, and there a choice was offered—all mathematics, or a mixture of mathematics and classics. I chose the mixture. At present classics

may be swallowed almost pure. The professorial lectures were quite optional, and felt to be nuisances to 'reading men.' Hence it was no wonder that I knew nothing of the chemical, botanical, medical, and even the modern history courses. Law and theology were never thought of, being mere specialties; the physical lectures I attended for mathematical reasons—they were almost entirely confined to physical optics. Now is not this a sad tale? For fifteen or sixteen years my life was given over principally to dead languages, with a little abstract mathematics. I am certain that when I took my degree, in 1837, I was totally ignorant of science proper, though I had some notion of mathematics; and my knowledge of those dead languages, over which I had spent so many years, was very small, poor and inaccurate. Yet I believe I was far above the average run. I had already done my school-work well, and I think got out of it as much as it was likely to give, and I took a fair place in both Triposes. A year after I took my degree I was advised to study in Germany, and was recommended to reside in Dresden. I actually did not know where Dresden was. I make this confession because it will show how utterly the study of language and mathematics had overshadowed everything. In Dresden was fought the greatest battle of the first Napoleon, which decided his fate more than that of Leipzig, yet I knew nothing of it—that is, nothing of modern history, of modern geography, of modern politics. Many years afterwards I availed myself of the privileges given to the amateurs at the University of Edinburgh to learn a little chemistry and practical physics. I was turned out on the world, after a finished classical school, private school, private tutor, and university education, with nothing but a very disjointed examinational knowledge of mathematics, a supreme ignorance of language as language, and a very insufficient of translating, a still less adequate of writing, and a totally non-existent speaking mastery over Latin and Greek. My French, excruciatingly horrible when I left school, had been a little smoothed down by a long vacation in Paris, but that was a direct setting-at-nought of usual custom. As for German, I had not attempted that till after I had taken my degree. Have I not a right to complain that my masters did not know how to lead a willing, industrious boy into better paths—did not even know how to make him understand the country in which they placed him?"

II.—M. Kaluza, Strophic Division in the Purely Alliterative Middle English Poetry. Strophic arrangement is most easily shown in *The Wars of Alexander* (EETS. ES 47). In this the number of lines to the strophe is 24, though to reach this result certain emendations and omissions are necessary. In *Crowned Kinge* the strophes are of 16 lines each; in *De Erkenwalde* of 16; in *Chevelere Assigne* the number is doubtful; in *The Sege of Jerusalem* it is 36; in *Patience* 24; in *Pearl* 60; in *Cleanness* 60; in *Morte Arthure* it is doubtful. Only occasionally do quatrains seem to occur in the remaining purely alliterative poems, such as *William of Palerne*, *Destruction of Troy*, *Piers Plowman*, *Richard the Redeles*, etc. Strophes of four or eight lines are sometimes found in poems which rime only in couplets, being recognized by divisions in the sense; so in the translation of the *Psalms*, *De Muliere Samaritana*, *On God Ureisin of Oure Lefdi*, *Poema Morale*, and *Passion* (OE. Miscellany).

E. H. C. Oliphant, *The Works of Beaumont and Fletcher*, III.

P. Holzhausen, *Dryden's Heroic Drama*. This is a continuation from vol. 14 of *Englische Studien* (see A. J. P. 13. 108), and in it he treats the following topics: The Action; The Delineation of Morals; Prologues and Epilogues, Prefaces and Dedications; The Dialogue (Style, Diction, Language); Metre. In conclusion he sums up the results to which his inquiries have led him: "Notwithstanding many successful scenes, many brilliant dialogues, unusual ease and elegance of language, and, in one word, many external merits, the poet's heroic drama is a failure in every essential respect—in the plan and construction of the fable, in complication and resolution, in 'motivation' and characterization. It is a failure because of its adherence to the mediaeval romances of chivalry and the French romances, because of the introduction and one-sided treatment of the motives of love and honor, which are fatal to all dramatic life, because of the poet's straining after the applause of the great and the acclamations of an empty-headed and degenerate rabble, and, not least of all, because Dryden was not a genuine, born dramatist.

"Are the heroic dramas less interesting on this account, quite apart from their surpassing interest for the history of culture and manners? The scientist, and particularly the physician, is no less interested in the apparently abnormal, the morbid, than in the normal. Just so in the history of art and culture an extraordinary interest is excited by those minds which, though highly gifted, have been unable to create anything classical, whether because their age was not yet in possession of a complete theory of art, or because they were hindered by the profligate life they led, or by outward and inward misfortune, from exalting themselves and their productions up to the height of the ideal, or, finally, because they allowed themselves to be entrapped by theories, or diverted by their education and models into paths from which their genius should have interdicted them. Hence our interest in persons like Peele, Greene and Marlowe, like Otway and Lee, like Gryphius and Lohenstein, like Lenz and Klinger, like Zacharias Werner, like Grabbe and Hebbel. Hence, too, our interest in Dryden as dramatist. He who would write the pathology of the drama could best study the distempers of the heroic drama in Dryden.

"I have already alluded to the circumstance that Dryden gave himself commendable trouble in his later years to cure his heroic malady (if the expression may be pardoned). In certain respects he fairly reversed his earlier theories in his later dramatic career (after 1676). This is particularly manifest in his relations to other poets and schools. If hitherto he had imitated the variety of action in the Elizabethan plays while adopting French models in his characterization, he now adhered to Shakespeare and Fletcher in the drawing of character, but emulated the French with respect to the unity of action. His drama has incontestably gained by this exchange, but his natural defects as dramatist could of course not be supplied in this way, especially when he had already passed the meridian of life."

W. Swoboda, *Mediators in the Struggle over Reform in the Teaching of Language*.

In the *Book Notices* there is a long review of Kölbing's edition of *Arthour and Merlin*, and shorter ones of Gollancz's *Pearl*, Skeat's *Chaucer's Prologue*, Pollard's *English Miracle Plays*, Crane's *Jacques de Vitry's Exempla*, Rose's

Syntax in Cynewulf's *Crist*. From the review of Crane's book by Lucy Toulmin Smith I quote: "English readers have had no such convenient means of learning the general scope of Jacques de Vitry's life and labors, so far as they are known, as Professor Crane now puts before them. He takes as the basis of his sketch F. L. Mätzner's dissertation of 1863, filling it in from his own wide reading, and accompanies all by bibliographic notes which are valuable for those who desire to pursue the subject further. . . . Proofs of his (de Vitry's) gifts among all kinds of people have come down to us in four collections of his sermons. These have been known to biographers, but it was only in 1861 that K. Goedeke, for the first time in modern days, called attention to the *exempla* of Jacques de Vitry. But even he did not know that they form a special characteristic of the prelate's *Sermones vulgares*, viz. anecdote and tale introduced in great abundance by the preacher for the illumination of his matter; and it is to Lecoy de la Marche, in 1868, that we owe the first clear account of the history of these *exempla*. . . . A valuable feature of Prof. Crane's work is the short analysis of each story; these abstracts, with notes giving numerous references and parallels found in other sources, make up more than a third of the volume."

The Miscellanea is wanting.

III.—O. Lengert, *The Scottish Romance*, Roswall and Lillian. Text and notes.

E. Koepfel, *Contributions to the History of the Elizabethan Drama*. Valuable notes on Gorboduc, Soliman and Perseda, Tamburlaine, Titus Andronicus, and *The Merchant of Venice*. Koepfel finds the source, or one of the principal sources, of Titus Andronicus in *Bandello*, the 21st novel of the 3d volume. *Bandello* refers to a Latin version by Pontanus; the story also occurs in Belleforest's *Histoires Tragiques*, and an English ballad on the subject is found in the *Roxburgh Ballads* (2. 339-47).

R. Thum, *Notes on Macaulay's History*, VIII. Continued from *Engl. Studien*, vol. 15 (see A. J. P. 13. 253).

The Book Notices review Skeat's *Principles of English Etymology*, Callaway's *Absolute Participle in Anglo-Saxon*, Schipper's *English Prosody*, Part II, Sommer's *Malory's Morte d'Arthur*, vol. III, Bennewitz's *Congreve and Molière*, Ackermann's *Sources, Models, and Materials of Shelley's Poetical Works* (*Alastor*, *Epipsyichidion*, *Adonais*, *Hellas*), and a number of less important productions.

The Miscellanea contains *Contributions to the Exegesis and Textual Criticism of Old and Middle English Documents*, IV, by F. Holthausen; this instalment is on *The Story of Genesis and Exodus*. F. Kluge has a note on *Fitela*. Other noticeable papers in this part are: *Unexplained Allusions and Quotations in Macaulay's Essays*, by A. Fels; *On Shakespeare's King Henry IV*, by E. Kölbing; *On the Material of Marlowe's Tamburlaine*, by L. Fränkel; and *Byron as an Imitator of Thomson*, by G. Sarrazin. Some of the parallels between *Childe Harold* and the *Castle of Indolence* are striking, and have not hitherto been noticed, so far as I am aware.

ALBERT S. COOK.